EXHIBIT 3

Muskegon Police Department Incident/Investigation Report, dated January 19, 2010

	Agency Name							7 1	INCIDENT/INVESTIGATION REPORT				ſč	Case#					
	Muskegon Police Department							1							2010-0	00980			
INCIDENT DATA	ORI MI 6160300													Date / Time Reported 01/19/2010 12:18 Tue Last Known Secure					
	Location of Incident 75 W Apple Av., Muskegon MI								Premise Type			Zone/Eract			01/19/2010 12:18 Tue				
	4.3 Crime Incident(s)						(Com)	Weapo	Weapon / Tools			10, 140), 0	01/19/2010 12:18 Tue					
	# 7	#1 Civil & Family Disputes					Entry	TO THE WASHING STREET, THE STR					Secui	rity					
	H	98006 Crime Incident						()		The state of the s				Activity					
	#2	†2					, ,		Weapon / Tools				···			nutrity			
								Entry	Entry Exit			Security			rity				
	#3	3 Crime Incident					()	Weapo	Weapon / Tools							Activity			
		1							Entry			Exit			Secur	ity			
мо								7.11											
	# of	Vict	ims 0	Турс	1	-	-14-11/0-	a Soldenia		Injury:	_	-							
v	Victiπ/Business Name (Last, First, Middle)								Victim of DC Crime #			OOB Race Sex Relation			ionship Resident Statu Tender		s Military Branch/Status		
I C T	Home Address								Age							Home Phone			
i M	Em	ploye	r Name	'Address		-				Business Ph			ess Phon	.	Mobile Ph	one			
	VYR Make Model Style C							Color	Color Lic/Lis			VIN	VIN						
0	CODES: V- Victim (Denote V2, V3) O = Owner (if other than victim) R = Reporting Person (if other than victim) Type: INDIVIDUAL/ NOT LAW ENFORCEMENT Injury:																		
T	Name (Last, First, Middle) Victim of DOR In Relationship Resident Status Military																		
H	RP SCOTT, BRIANNA MARIE Chinie # To Offender Resident Resident																		
R											ne Phone								
S	Employer Name/Address												Business Phone Mob				ODE		
I N												×							
V	Type: INDIVIDUAL/ NOT LAW ENFORCEMENT Injury:																		
0	Crime # 1									Resident Status	Military Branch/Status								
L V	IO Home Address Home Phone										J								
E	1101		iui cos	201 1210 -2 111 - 221											Hor	ينونكن ا			
	Employer Name/Address									Business Ph				ess Phone	one Mobile Phone				
	1 = None 2 = Burned 3 = Counterfeit / Forged 4 = Daitingco7 varidalized 5 = Recovered 6 = Seized 7 = Stolen 8 = Unknown																		
	(*OJ* = Recovered for Other Jurisdiction)																		
	VI Code Status Value OJ QTY					Property Description				——	Make/Model			Seri	Serial Number				
İ																			
P																			
R					-														
P	-				-						_			-					
E R	7				1						-				_	-			
T											-					+			
Y						28													
										OMESTICATION OF THE PARTY OF TH									
}	-		3.5		-									_	DRA	KE0084			
	Offic	cer/ID)#	FLYNN, C.	R M	เบคม	CRFI		- V2/C			100 0		-					
	Inve	st ID#		(0)	(10)	V1 10	1/	· ·				Superv	isor	LOI	D. D	A. (MUPDE	(ALI)		
Status	Com	plain	ant Sign					Case Startus		ATAC	2010	Case D	isposition		_,	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	Page 1		
	Printe	ed By	: MUPE	KIBI, PD-R	EC-02			Clos	ea	01/20/	2010	S	ys#: 1687	77		01/2	2/2010 15:02:41		

Case 1:10-cv-00185-RJJ ECF No. 9-4 filed 05/18/10 PageID.47 Page 3 of 5

Incident Report Additional Name List

Muskegon Police Department	0	OCA: 2010-00980			
Additional Name List			ii.	Pag	ge 2
NameCode/# Name (Last, First, Middle)	Victim of Crime#	DOB	Age	Race	Sex
1) IO 2 DEJUSTO, MADELYN		02/12/1946	63	W	F
Address 75 W Apple Av , Muskegon, MI		Н;			
Empl/Addr Drake And Scott		В:			
	i	Mobile#:			

DRAKE0085

Case 1:10-cv-00185-RJJ ECF No. 9-4 filed 05/18/10 PageID.48 Page 4 of 5

INCIDENT/INVESTIGATION REPORT

By: MUPDKIBI, PD-REC-02 01/22/2010

eit / Forged 4 = Damaged 5 = Reco		= Unknown Up to 3 types of activity
Measure Suspected	Турс	Up to 3 types of activity
	——————————————————————————————————————	
i), WILLIAMS, J.D. (MUPDJI.	OWI)	
	I), WILLIAMS, J.D. (MUPDJI.	I), WILLIAMS, J.D. (MUPDJDWI)

Case 1:10-cv-00185-RJJ ECF No. 9-4 filed 05/18/10 PageID.49 Page 5 of 5

	REPORTING OFFICER NARRATIVE		
Muskegon Police Department	2010-00980		
Victim	Offense CIVIL & FAMILY DISPUTES	Date / Time Reported Tue 01/19/2010 12:18	
THE INFORMATION BI	ELOW IS CONFIDENTIAL - FOR USE BY AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL C	DNLY	

01-19-10 1218hrs

I responded to the attorney offices of Drake and Scott at 75 W. Apple Ave in the city of Muskegon in reference to an employee refusing to leave after being terminated. Upon arrival, I met with the caller, SCOTT. She advised that she had just terminated an employee and that the employee was in the office of DRAKE with the door closed.

SCOTT handed me a court order (TRO) that stated that she had control of the company and could make decisions based on the best interest of the company. At this time, I was not aware that DRAKE and SCOTT were in proceedings to dissolve the company and part ways as law firm partners.

I knocked and entered into the office of DRAKE and met with her and DEJUSTO. After a brief discussion, I found that DEJUSTO is the mother to DRAKE and has been employed at DRAKE and SCOTT for some time now. SCOTT terminated DEJUSTO and wanted her to leave the building. DRAKE advised DEJUSTO that she was not terminated and "rehired" DEJUSTO immediately after being let go by SCOTT. DRAKE advised that DEJUSTO would work out of her office until things get resolved.

There is also a valid PPO that DRAKE obtained in Oceana County against SCOTT that allows them to continue to work together but they are not allowed to communicate with each other. This strains the issues further as this civil process continues forward. Due to DRAKE and SCOTT being well known attorneys in Muskegon County, our judges would not get involved in the civil process they are going through so other venues were sought out to deal with this.

After listening to all parties involved, I could not find a valid reason to make DEJUSTO leave the property. DRAKE and SCOTT are still partners and owners of the firm and properties contained. They both can make decisions jointly or seperately in regards to the business and its employees. No assaults took place and things were being handled in an adult manner amongst them. It is readily apparent that the working relationship is strained. SCOTT advised that the computer and phone systems are being monitored for any discrepancies involving the business and its employees. DRAKE immediately stated that she wanted this information documented in the report as this was a federal offense. After hearing this, SCOTT requested that I document that DEJUSTO was now trespassing and that she was going to go over to the county building to obtain paperwork against DEJUSTO for the trespassing.

At this point in this civil process, DEJUSTO is not trespassing as DRAKE rehired her as her employee. DEJUSTO was not warned for trespassing either. Until the court proceedings are completed and a decision is made on the issues at hand, this complaint is civil in nature with no criminal activity noted. CLEARED

Sergeant Flynn

DRAKE0087

Page 4